



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,323	03/19/2004	James Andrew Bennett	50037.225US01	1745
27488 7590 03/31/2008 MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903				
EXAMINER				
RIDER, JUSTIN W				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/31/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/806,323

**Applicant(s)**

BENNETT, JAMES ANDREW

**Examiner**

JUSTIN W. RIDER

**Art Unit**

2626

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-14 and 18-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 11-14 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S506)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

1. In response to the Office Action mailed 24 August 2007, applicant submitted a response filed 26 December 2007, in which the applicant amended claims 1, 4-7, 10-14, 18 and 21 without adding new matter. Applicant cancelled claims 8-9, 15-17 and 23-24.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 has been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. It is additionally noted that the newly claimed 'identifiers' (e.g. local and network service) are merely tags that assist in assigning a language to a particular application and so therefore, the identifiers alone do not change the scope of the claims as compared to the previous set of claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

**Crandall (US 2002/0156902 A1)** referred to as **Crandall** hereinafter.

*Claim 1:* **Crandall** discloses a computer-implemented method for synchronizing a language of an application and a network page, comprising:

i. obtaining a local identifier associated with an application on a client computing device wherein the local identifier indicates a language of the application (Fig. 3, the cultural profile provides local identifiers that are associated with languages (part 31).);

ii. obtaining a network service identifier associated with a network service, wherein the network service identifier indicates a language of the network service (Process outlined in Fig. 4 (e.g. client → host));

iii. comparing the local identifier to the network service identifier (p. 2, paragraph [0019], *'The system would then preferably interface with a client application...'*);

iv. in response to comparing the local identifier to the network service identifier, generating a prompt for selecting whether to change the language of the network page to correspond to the language of the application when the local identifier and the network service identifier do not correspond (Figs. 1 and 2; p. 2, paragraphs [0015]-[0017]); and

v. changing the language of the network page to correspond to the language of the application when a change of the language of the network page is selected (p. 2, paragraph [0019], *'Using these communicated objects, a GUI of the client application would preferably be configured according to the communicated ethnicity objects.'*).

**Claim 2:** **Crandall** discloses a computer-implemented method as per claim 1 above, further comprising determining whether a change occurred to the language of the application during an offline [local] mode (p. 3, paragraph [0024] discusses the analysis between application and locally stored settings).

**Claim 3:** **Crandall** discloses a computer-implemented method as per claim 2 above, wherein the language of the network page is transparently changed to correspond to the language

of the application when a change occurred to the language of the application during the offline mode (p. 3, paragraph [0024] discusses the analysis between application and locally stored settings, *'to render the customized GUI presented to the user.'*).

Claim 4: **Crandall** discloses a computer-implemented method as per claim 1 above, wherein comparing the local identifier and the network service identifier further comprises retrieving the local identifier and the network service identifier from data storage locations (p. 3, paragraph [0026] discusses the language analysis between application and network over a client/server networking setup.).

Claim 5: **Crandall** discloses a computer-implemented method as per claim 4 above, wherein the data storage location for the local identifier is a local setting (p. 3, paragraph [0026]).

Claim 6: **Crandall** discloses a computer-implemented method as per claim 4 above, wherein the data storage location for the network service identifier is a user profile included in an online data store (p. 3, paragraph [0026]).

Claim 7: Wherein **Crandall** discloses a method as per claim 1 above, it is further inherently necessary that when comparing languages as per the above claimed invention that if the two languages are either i) the same or ii) refused change by user, that no change in the interface language should change.

Claim 18: Claim 18 is substantially similar in scope and content to that of claim 1 above and so therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 19: **Crandall** discloses a system as per claim 18 above, wherein the language application is further configured to determine whether a change occurred to the language of the

client application during an offline [local] mode (p. 3, paragraph [0024] discusses the analysis between application and locally stored settings).

Claim 20: **Crandall** discloses a system as per claim 18 above, wherein the language application is further configured to transparently change the language of the network page to correspond to the language of the client application when a change occurred to the language of the client application during the offline mode (p. 3, paragraph [0024] discusses the analysis between application and locally stored settings, *'to render the customized GUI presented to the user.'*

Claim 21: **Crandall** discloses a system as per claim 18 above, wherein the language application is further configured to retrieve the language of the client application from a local setting and the language of the network page from the online data store (p. 3, paragraph [0026], steps 402-404).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Crandall**.

Claims 7 and 22: **Crandall** discloses the method, system and computer-readable medium as in claims 1 and 18 above. However, **Crandall** fails to specifically disclose avoiding changing

the language of a network page if it is unnecessary. The examiner is asserting that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a feature that would avoid performing an unnecessary and computationally expensive task. The idea of not performing a task if it does not apply is common knowledge throughout the art. An example being if a German network user is accessing a network page that is in German, and this user has a German profile within the system, changing the language to German would be redundant. Further, changing to English or Italian would be counterproductive to the scope of invention and so the above limitation is a necessarily well-known feature in such an implementation to avoid confusion.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Crandall** in view of **Constable et al. 'Language identification and IT: Addressing problems of linguistic diversity on a global scale', SIL Electronic Working Papers 2000-001** referred to as **Constable** hereinafter.

Claim 10: **Crandall** discloses a computer-implemented method as per claim 9 above, however failing to, but **Constable** does specifically disclose a system for customizing processes within an information technology setting to work with a variety of languages wherein unique language identifiers include LCID (p. 12, section 5.1, *'That LANGIDs (actually, sub-language identifiers) are really being used to distinguish cultural conventions, which are usually associated with locales, is evident from examining the structure of LCIDs: these are 32-bit constants that are made up of a LANGID and a sort ID.'*) and RFC-1766 (p. 3, Introduction, *'In this paper, we will consider some existing systems for language identification in use within IT*

*today. These will focus primarily on three particular systems, because of their widespread use and importance within IT: Win32 LANGIDs [6] (used in Microsoft Windows); RFC 1766 [1] (used in XML [7]); and ISO 639(-x) [3, 4] (used in a variety of IT systems and as a basis for other IT standards).') values.*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the teachings of **Constable** in the system of **Crandall** because the information technology industry has been driven to such measures due to a global explosion in technology. A rapid increase in economic development has allow all sorts of information to become available to a diverse group of users and so **Constable** addresses this issue, providing advantageous solutions to many common problems, such as: the difficulty in obtaining complete and accurate knowledge of languages, it is impossible to create a static categorization of all languages; different operational definitions of language that can serve different purposes lead to different categorizations of languages that may not agree with one another; existing systems of language identifiers do not employ consistent operational definitions and in many cases list objects that are not languages per se; there are on the order of 6,800 languages known to exist in the world today, which is an order of magnitude greater than what existing systems of language identifiers currently cover, and existing systems do not scale well; and existing systems of language identifiers do not adequately document what language-related category is denoted by a given identifier; in most cases, they provide nothing further than a name, which is inadequate in most cases (Introduction). Further, the RFC 1766 is a community request initiated in 1995 in order to standardize language tagging used in information objects and so therefore has become an accepted method of specifying the language of a text. Also, LCIDs are a standard



international numeric abbreviation consisting of a unique 32-bit value that includes a language identifier and sort order identifier. This is used across the board to define not only a language specification but also a region and culture for formatting (e.g. date, time, etc) purposes.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 11-14 are allowed. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The combination of features of claim 11 is not taught or suggested by the cited reference. **Crandall** teaches setting a cultural profile on an application. The cultural profile dictates what type of information will be displayed on a website or associated application. Stated another way, the cultural profile is preset by a user and the cultural profile then drives the type of displayed information. Crandall does not teach or suggest "wherein the locale identifier is converted to a Hex locale identifier," "wherein the network service identifier includes a string value," and "storing the Hex locale identifier and the string value in a table." Furthermore, Crandall does not teach or suggest "determining whether a change occurred to the language of the application during an offline mode by detecting a changed value in a registry key," and "automatically changing the language of the network page to correspond to the language of the application when the registry key indicates a changed value." Among other features Crandall, Crandall does not teach or suggest "comparing the Hex locale identifier stored in the table to the string value stored in the table when no change occurred to the language of the application during the offline mode," and "in response to comparing the Hex locale identifier to the string value, generating a prompt for selecting whether to change the language of the network page to

correspond to the language of the application when the Hex locale identifier and the string value do not correspond." Accordingly, independent claim 11 is allowable.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### *Conclusion*

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUSTIN W. RIDER whose telephone number is (571)270-1068. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R. Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. W. R./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2626  
24 March 2008

/David R Hudspeth/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626